



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,965	08/17/2001	John Hediger	2001P10619 US01	5422
7590	07/30/2004		EXAMINER	
Elsa Keller, Legal Assistant Intellectual Property Department SIEMENS CORPORATION 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			TANG, KUO LIANG J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2122	
DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/931,965	HEDIGER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Kuo-Liang J Tang	2122

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_.

WEI Y. ZHEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Response to Arguments  
Applicant's arguments filed 6/14/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. Applicant argues that for Claims 1 and 23, Delo does not show or suggest "deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application" and "incorporating the derived installation related information" into "template installation information to form installation instruction data" (Remark, pages 8-11). Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not show or suggest "deriving installation related information supporting data exchange between different systems from configuration data associated with the application" and "incorporating the derived installation related information" into "template installation information to form installation instruction data" (Remark, pages 8-11) by charactering that Delo Figure 4 or elsewhere fails to show or suggest incorporation of "derived installation related information" into "template installation information" at all and does not even discuss or mention "template installation installation instruction information" (Remark, page 9, lines 21-24). It does not show or suggest "installation instruction information" (Remark, page 9, lines 27-28). It does not show or suggest "automated" generation of such "installation related information" (Remark, page 10, lines 31-32). However, it should be noted that each table is equivalent to each "template installation installation instruction information" (E.g. see FIG. 4,tables 405, 415, 425 , 435 and associated text). The stats column of tables in FIG. 4 show "installation instruction information" (E.g. see col. 11:28-46). Delo suggests "automated" generation of such "installation related information" (E.g. see FIG. 6 step 665 and associated text, e.g. see col. 16:27-30).

2. Applicant argues that for Claim 2, there is no suggestion in Delo of extracting "prompting questions to be answered by a user upon installation of the application" that "support data exchange between different systems from the configuration data associated" with the "application" for which "installation instructions" are being generated. (Remark, page 11, lines 26-29).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not suggest "prompting questions to be answered by a user upon installation of the application" that "support data exchange between different systems from the configuration data associated" with the "application" fo which "installation instructions" are being generated.

However, it should be noted that Delo the prompt question occurs at Figure 6, step 615, which is still in the process of installation of the application and is before the "installation instructions" are being generated (E.g. see Figure 6 step 665 and associated text).

3. Applicant argues that for Claim 4, Delo does not show (or suggest) the combination of features of claim 4 involving "formatting" the derived installation instruction data" supporting "data exchange between different systems" as "installation documentation for reproduction on an output device, the output device comprising a printer and a video display".

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not suggest the combination of features of claim 4. However, it is disclosed in page 4 of the Office Action mailed on 5/20/2004.

4. Applicant argues that for Claim 5, Delo does NOT show "installation instructions" but merely "Information required to effect the installation" (Remark, page 12, lines 8-9) and there is no suggestion in Delo of automated generation of installation instructions by derivin "installation instruction text data for output as installation documentation" that supports "data exchange between different systems from th configuration data associated" with the "application" for which "installation instructions" are being generated. (Remark, page 12, lines 12-16)

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not show "installation instructions". In fact, "Information required to effect th installation" is "installation instructions". Further, again, as noted above of Claim 1, Delo suggests "automated" generation of such "installation related information" (E.g. see FIG. 6 step 665 and associated text, e.g. see col. 16:27-30).

5. Applicant argues that for Claim 7, Delo does NOT show "template installation information" (Remark, page 12, lines 23-24).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not show "template installation information". Again, as noted above of Claim 1, Delo suggests each table is equivalent to each "template installation installation instruction information" (E.g. se FIG. 4,tables 405, 415, 425 , 435 and associated text).

6. Applicant argues that for Claims 8-10, there is no suggestion in Delo of the feature combination of claim 8 including "creating a prompt question generating routine for inclusion in the installation instruction data by incorporating prompt questions into a predetermined question prompting executable procedure, the prompt questions being for answer by a user upon installation of the application" (Remark, page 13).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not show "the feature combination of claim 8. However, it is disclosed in pages 4-5 of the Office Action mailed on 5/20/2004.

7. Applicant argues that for Claim 11, Delo does not provide enabling disclosure of HOW installation instructions are generated" (Remark, page 14).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not provide enabling disclosure of HOW installation instructions are generated. In fact, Delo discloses HOW installation instructions are generated(E.g. see Figure 6, step 665 and associated text).

8. Applicant argues that for Claims 13and 15, Delo does not suggest "automated generation of installation instruction documentation" including data "supporting data exchange between different systems" or "storage" of such "installation instruction documentation" on a "medium together with the application". Delo does not provide enabling disclosure of HOW installation instructions are generated" (Remark, pages 14-15).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not suggest "automated generation of installation instruction documentation" and "provide enabling disclosure of HOW installation instructions are generated". In fact, Delo suggests "automated" generation of such "installation related information" (E.g. see FIG. 6 step 665 and associated text, e.g. see col. 16:27-30). Further Delo discloses HOW installation instructions are generated (E.g. see 2Figure 6, step 665 and associated text).

9. Applicant argues that for Claim 16, is considered for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 8 ( Remark, pages 15-16).

Again, see as noted above of Claims 1 and 8.

10. Applicant argues that for Claim 18, Delo does not show or suggest "creating a prompt question generating procedure for generating the prompt questions for answer by the user". (Remark, page 16).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not suggest "creating a prompt question generating procedure for generating the prompt questions for answer by the user". However, it should be noted that Delo suggests "creating a prompt question generating procedure for generating the prompt questions for answer by the user" (E.g. see col. 14:45 to col. 15:2).

11. Applicant argues that for Claim 19, Delo does not show or suggest "larger set of prompt questions". (Remark, page 16).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not suggest "creating a prompt question generating procedure for generating the prompt questions for answer by the user". However, it should be noted that Delo suggests "creating a prompt question generating procedure for generating the prompt questions for answer by the user" (E.g. see col. 14:45 to col. 15:2, which states "... which presents the user with the option of selecting which features of the product to install. ..."(emphasis added) ).

12. Applicant argues that for Claims 20 and 21, are considered for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 8 and 16 ( Remark page 16).

Again, see as noted above of Claims 1, 8 and 16.

13. Applicant argues that for Claims 6, 3 and 12, Delo does not suggest "automated generation of installation instruction documentation" (Remark, page 17-18).

Examiner disagree with Applicant's assertion. that Delo does not suggest "automated generation of installation instruction documentation". In fact, Delo suggests "automated" generation of such "installation related information" (E.g. see FIG. 6 step 665 and associated text, e.g. see col. 16:27-30).

14. Applicant argues that for Claims 14and 22, are considered for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 3 ( Remark, page 19).

Again, see as noted above of Claims 1 and 3.

15. Applicant argues that for Claim 22, is considered for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 3 ( Remark, page 19). Again, see as noted above of Claims 1 and 3.